arXiv:1303.4284v1 [quant-ph] 18 Mar 2013

Uniqueness of the equation for state-vector collapse

Angelo Bassi*
Department of Physics, University of Trieste,
Strada Costiera 11, 34151 Trieste, Italy and
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Trieste Section, Via Valerio 2, 34127 Trieste, Italy

Detlef Dürr† and Günter Hinrichs‡
Mathematisches Institut der L.M.U., Theresienstr. 39, 80333 München, Germany.

The linearity of quantum mechanics leads, under the assumption that the wave function offers a complete description of reality, to grotesque situations famously known as Schrödinger's cat. Ways out are either adding elements of reality or replacing the linear evolution by a nonlinear one. Models of spontaneous wave function collapses took the latter path. The way such models are constructed leaves the question, whether such models are in some sense unique, i.e. whether the nonlinear equations replacing Schrödinger's equation, are uniquely determined as collapse equations. First Adler, and more recently Weinberg, worked on identifying the class of nonlinear modifications of the Schrödinger equation, compatible with general physical requirements. Here we argue that such considerations lead in fact to the usual collapse models.

---

* bassi@ts.infn.it
† duerr@mathematik.uni-muenchen.de
‡ hinrichs@math.lmu.de

I. INTRODUCTION

The superposition principle of quantum mechanics has always been an open issue. The strongest reason is that the collapse of the wave function, which has been formulated to avoid macroscopic superpositions, is clearly an artifact [1]. To overcome this situation, collapse models have been devised, which incorporate wave-function's collapse, together with the Schrödinger evolution, into one single (nonlinear and stochastic) dynamical law [2–8]. Independently from this, Weinberg questioned whether quantum mechanics, being a linear theory, should be regarded as an approximation of an underlying non-linear theory [9], pretty much in the same way in which Newtonian gravity is a weak-limit limit of general relativity. Moreover when one combines quantum mechanics and gravity even in the most naive way, by taking into account the gravitational interaction of the wave function with itself, one obtains nonlinear evolutions [10–12].

Quantum linearity has been challenged also experimentally, and the interest and efforts are constantly increasing. Perhaps the most famous tests are diffraction experiments with macromolecules [13–15]. In the most recent experiment of this kind, quantum coherence was proven to hold for molecules with up to about 7000 amu [15]. The question remains open whether larger systems still enjoy this property. Other proposals, representing a direct test of quantum linearity, include satellite atom (Cs) [16], micro-mirrors [17], nano-sphere interferometric experiments [18]. To these, one should add the vast zoo of indirect tests of the superposition principle [6, 19].

Among all proposals for nonlinear modifications of quantum mechanics, only collapse models survived. The most important reason is that, in response to Weinberg's attempt to modifying quantum theory in a nonlinear sense, N. Gisin [20, 21], followed by J. Polcinski [22], proved that any nonlinear and deterministic modification of the theory yields superluminal signalling. Therefore only *stochastic* nonlinear modifications are allowed. Collapse models fall in this class. However, it is not clear at all whether they should be the only possible models, since their nonlinear structure is very specific and given by the following stochastic differential equation [5]:

$$\mathrm{d}\psi_t = \left[-iH\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (L_k - \ell_{k,t})\,\mathrm{d}W_{k,t} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(L_k^\dagger L_k - 2\ell_{k,t}L_k + |\ell_{k,t}|^2\right)\mathrm{d}t \right]\psi_t, \tag{1}$$

$$\ell_{k,t} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\langle \psi_t, (L_k^\dagger + L_k)\psi_t \rangle \tag{2}$$

where H is the standard quantum Hamiltonian of the system, L_k are linear operators defining the preferred basis for the collapse, and $W_{k,t}$ standard Wiener processes. As one can see, nonlinearity enters in a very specific way. Of course the above equation can be generalized, e.g. by by considering other kinds of noise. One can also consider jump-type models, like the GRW model [2], instead of diffusion processes. Nevertheless, the basic structure does not change.

S.L. Adler and T.A. Brun were the first to raise the question whether indeed collapse models are the only models compatible with the no-faster-than-light requirement [23, 24]. This assumption is used in the context of Gisin's theorem [20, 21] and implies that, whatever the evolution for the state-vector, the equivalence among statistical ensembles must be preserved [25]. Such considerations lead to linear evolutions of statistical operators. According to the work of G. Lindblad [26] and of V. Gorini, A. Kossakowsky and E.C.G. Sudarshan [27], they have to be of the *Lindblad type.* The question can be thus phrased as follows:

Question: *Given a diffusion process for the wave-function:*

$$d\psi_t = A(\psi_t)\,dt + \sum_{k=1}^{m} B_k(\psi_t)\,dW_{k,t}, \tag{3}$$

where $A(\psi)$ and $B_k(\psi)$ are unspecified nonlinear operators, find the conditions under which it generates a Lindblad type of equation:

$$\frac{d\rho_t}{dt} = -i[H,\rho_t] + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(L_k\rho_t L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}L_k^\dagger L_k\rho_t - \frac{1}{2}\rho_t L_k^\dagger L_k\right) \tag{4}$$

for the statistical operator $\rho_t \equiv \mathbb{E}[|\psi_t\rangle\langle\psi_t|]$.

One should specify that the above quoted theorems of Lindblad and of Gorini, Kossakowski and Sudarshan require other assumptions besides linearity of the dynamics; in particular, they require a quantum-dynamical semi-group type of evolution, and complete positivity. The first assumption basically amounts to *Markovianity* of the dynamics which usually is accepted for fundamental evolutions as we consider here. The second assumption, can be motivated by the requirement that reduction to subsystem descriptions, i.e. tracing out of "bath" variables should produce equations of the same type as the initial one. With the above specifications, one can say that the no-faster-than-light condition implies a Lindblad type of evolution for the statistical operator.

Adler and Brun provided a partial answer to the question, their proof being restricted to the very special case of linear operators [28]. Recently, also S. Weinberg [8] raised the same question. Here we answer the question in full generality, by proving the following statement.

Main Result. *Eq.* (3) *leads to Eq.* (4) *if and only if the operators $A(\psi)$ and $B_k(\psi)$ take the following form:*

$$A(\psi) = -iH - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(L_k^\dagger L_k - 2\ell_{k,t}^{(\psi)}L_k^{(\psi)} + |\ell_{k,t}^{(\psi)}|^2\right) \tag{5}$$

$$B_k(\psi) = L_k^{(\psi)} - \ell_{k,t}^{(\psi)}, \qquad \ell_{k,t}^{(\psi)} = \frac{1}{2}\langle\psi_t,(L_k^{(\psi)\dagger} + L_k^{(\psi)})\psi_t\rangle \tag{6}$$

modulo unimportant global phase factors. The operators $L_k^{(\psi)}$ *and their "adjoints" are defined as follows,*

$$L_k^{(\psi)} := \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{kj}(\psi)\, L_j, \qquad L_k^{(\psi)\dagger} := \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{kj}^{*}(\psi)\, L_j^{\dagger}. \tag{7}$$

where $u_{kj}(\psi)$ *are the unknown coefficients of a* $n \times n$ *unitary matrix. This unitary freedom, which is a symmetry of the Lindblad equation* (4) *but not of the diffusion equation* (3)*, implies that the allowed diffusions range from linear diffusion (no collapse) to the usual collapse equation. The collapse rate for the diffusion is maximal for the usual collapse equation* (1)*.*

This is a remarkable result: it basically says that collapse models are the only possible nonlinear extensions of the Schrödinger equation, compatible with the no-faster-than-light assumption.

II. PROOF OF THE STATEMENT

First of all let us note that, without loss of generality, in Eqs. (3) and (4) we can take $m = n$. In fact if, for example, $m > n$, then we can add $m - n$ null operators to Eq. (4) to increase the sum up to m.

Step 1. By using Itô calculus [29], one can show that Eq. (3) leads to the following master equation for $\rho_t := \mathbb{E}[|\psi_t\rangle\langle\psi_t|]$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = \mathbb{E}\left(|A(\psi_t)\rangle\langle\psi_t| + |\psi_t\rangle\langle A(\psi_t)| + \sum_{k=1}^{m} |B_k(\psi_t)\rangle\langle B_k(\psi_t)|\right). \tag{8}$$

Let us choose a deterministic initial value ψ in Eq. (3). Correspondingly, we set $\rho_0 := |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ as the initial value in Eq. (4). Let us set both Eq. (8) and (4) equal at time $t = 0$. This will be sufficient, because the equations are Markovian and time-homogenous. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} &|A(\psi)\rangle\langle\psi| + |\psi\rangle\langle A(\psi)| + \sum_{k=1}^{n} |B_k(\psi)\rangle\langle B_k(\psi)| = \\ &= |-iH\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + |\psi\rangle\langle -iH\psi| + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(|L_k\psi\rangle\langle L_k\psi| - \frac{1}{2}|L_k^{\dagger}L_k\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - \frac{1}{2}|\psi\rangle\langle L_k^{\dagger}L_k\psi|\right). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Step 2. Since B_k and L_k are the only operators appearing in the "bra" and "ket" part simultaneously, then the B_k are essentially fixed by the L_k. To find out how, we restrict Eq. (9) to the orthogonal complement of ψ. Writing the corresponding orthogonal decomposition of vectors as $v = v_{\perp} + v_{\|}$, we get:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} |B_k(\psi)_{\perp}\rangle\langle B_k(\psi)_{\perp}| = \sum_{k=1}^{n} |(L_k\psi)_{\perp}\rangle\langle (L_k\psi)_{\perp}|. \tag{10}$$

This implies that:

$$B_k(\psi)_\perp \;=\; \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{kj}(\psi)\,(L_j\psi)_\perp, \tag{11}$$

where the functionals $u_{kj}(\psi)$ are the coefficients of a ψ-dependent *unitary* matrix [30]. Therefore we can write:

$$B_k(\psi) \;=\; \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{kj}(\psi)\,(L_j\psi)_\perp \;-\; \tilde{\ell}_k^{(\psi)}\psi, \tag{12}$$

for unspecified functionals $\tilde{\ell}_k^{(\psi)}$ of ψ. Equivalently, we can write:

$$B_k(\psi) \;=\; \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{kj}(\psi)\,L_j\psi \;-\; \ell_k^{(\psi)}\psi \;=\; L_k^{(\psi)}\psi \;-\; \ell_k^{(\psi)}\psi \tag{13}$$

where $L_k^{(\psi)}$ is defined as (7), and we have defined:

$$\ell_k^{(\psi)}\psi \;=\; \tilde{\ell}_k^{(\psi)}\psi + \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{kj}(\psi)\,(L_j\psi)_\parallel\,. \tag{14}$$

Step 3. We now determine the operator A. For this, we substitute the previous result into Eq. (9) and we multiply with ψ from the left and $v\perp\psi$ from the right. We get:

$$\langle A(\psi), v\rangle - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \ell_k^{(\psi)}\langle L_k^{(\psi)}\psi, v\rangle = i\langle H\psi, v\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\langle L_k^\dagger L_k\psi, v\rangle. \tag{15}$$

Since v is a generic vector orthogonal to ψ, the above equation implies that the parts of $A(\psi) - \sum_{k=1}^{n}\ell_k^{(\psi)*}L_k^{(\psi)}\psi$ and of $-iH - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}L_k^\dagger L_k\psi$ orthogonal to ψ coincide, while the parallel part of $A(\psi)$ is arbitrary. Therefore, similarly to the previous step, one can write:

$$A(\psi) = -iH\psi - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(L_k^\dagger L_k\psi - 2\ell_k^{(\psi)*}L_k^{(\psi)}\psi\right) + G(\psi)\psi \tag{16}$$

with arbitrary complex functional G.

Step 4. Substituting Eqs. (13) and (16) into (9) and multiplying from both sides with ψ gives:

$$G(\psi) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k}|\ell_k^{(\psi)}|^2 + ig(\psi) \tag{17}$$

with real functional g.

Step 5. Now we apply the condition of norm preservation for the diffusion process given by Eq. (3). The stochastic differential equation for the square norm of ψ_t is:

$$\mathrm{d}\|\psi_t\|^2 = \left(\langle\psi, A(\psi)\rangle + \langle A(\psi),\psi\rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\langle B_k(\psi), B_k(\psi)\rangle\right)\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\langle\psi, B_k(\psi)\rangle + \langle B_k(\psi),\psi\rangle\right)\mathrm{d}W_{k,t} \tag{18}$$

which should be zero, for the norm to be conserved. Because of the previous relations, one can show that drift term is automatically zero, while requiring that also the diffusion terms are zero, give:

$$\langle \psi, L_k^{(\psi)} \psi \rangle + \langle L_k^{(\psi)} \psi, \psi \rangle - 2\,\mathrm{Re}[\ell_k^{(\psi)}] = 0, \qquad k = 1, \ldots n \tag{19}$$

or:

$$\ell_k^{(\psi)} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi, (L_k^{(\psi)\dagger} + L_k^{(\psi)}) \psi \rangle - i h_k(\psi)\,, \tag{20}$$

for arbitrary real-valued functionals $h_k(\psi)$. Eq. (13), with $\ell_k^{(\psi)}$ given by Eq. (20), identifies the operators $B_k(\psi)$. Similarly, Eq. (16), with $G(\psi)$ given by Eq. (17), identifies the operator $A(\psi)$. So far, the unspecified quantities are the functionals $h_k(\psi)$ and $g(\psi)$, as well as the coefficients $u_{kj}(\psi)$.

It is easy to see that he functionals g and h_k are unimportant global phase factors. In fact, $\varphi_t := e^{-i\int_0^t g(s)\mathrm{d}s}\psi_t$ satisfies Eq. (8) with $g = 0$. In a similar way, $\phi_t := e^{-i\sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^t h_k(s) dW_{k,s}}\varphi_t$ satisfies Eq. (8) with $g = h_k = 0$, as a simple application of Itô's formula shows. Therefore the only degree of freedom is encoded in the the unitary matrix with coefficients $u_{kj}(\psi)$.

By straightforward use of Itô calculus, the operators A and B_k we have found, indeed reproduce the Lindblad equation (4). Therefore also the 'if' part is proven. This concludes the proof of the statement.

To understand the meaning of the unitary freedom, let us consider the simpler case of only one self-adjoint Lindblad operator L. In such a case, the unitary matrix reduces to a complex phase factor $e^{if(\psi)}$. Eq. (3), with the previous specifications for A and B_k, becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}\psi_t = {} & -iH\psi_t \mathrm{d}t + \Big(e^{if(\psi_t)} L\psi_t - \langle \psi_t, L\psi_t \rangle \psi_t \cos(f(\psi_t)) \Big)\, \mathrm{d}W_t \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \Big(L^2 \psi_t - 2 e^{if(\psi_t)} \langle \psi_t, L\psi_t \rangle L\psi_t \cos(f(\psi_t)) + |\langle \psi_t, L\psi_t \rangle|^2 \psi_t \cos^2(f(\psi_t)) \Big)\, \mathrm{d}t, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

When $f = 0$, one recovers the standard collapse equation [5]. For $f = \pi/2$ instead, all non-linear terms vanish: one obtains a linear and random evolution, which, written in the Stratonovich formalism—which is closer to the physicists' usual formalism—becomes:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\psi_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = -i \left[H - L w_t \right] \psi_t, \tag{22}$$

with $w_t = \mathrm{d}W_t / \mathrm{d}t$. This is a standard Schrödinger with a random potential, which does not give rise to the collapse of the wave function (since it is linear), but nevertheless originates the same Lindblad equation for the density matrix. This is an entirely expected result, and the previous literature is aware of such a fact, i.e. that there are infinite stochastic unravellings of the same master equation [31, 32].

One way to understand the meaning of f is to say that it measures the "anti-hermitian" part of the coupling of the noise with the wave function, which is the one responsible for the collapse. The maximum such coupling is obtained precisely for $f = 0$. It is in fact, let us neglect the Hamiltonian H and let us compute the equation for the variance $V_t := \langle\psi_t, L^2\psi_t\rangle - \langle\psi_t, L\psi_t\rangle^2$, which is a measure of how the stavector is delocalized over the eigenstates of L. One obtains [33]:

$$\mathrm{d}V_t = -4\cos^2(f(\psi_t))V_t^2\mathrm{d}t + 2\cos(f(\psi_t))\langle\psi_t, (L - \langle\psi_t, L\psi_t\rangle)^3\psi_t\rangle\mathrm{d}W_t\,. \tag{23}$$

The drift term (which proportional to $-V_t^2$) drives V_t to zero for large times and for almost any realization of the noise, as expected from a collapse equation. The rate is proportional to $\cos^2(f(\psi_t))$ and of course is maximal for $f = 0$. This is the standard choice for collapse models.

III. FOKKER-PLANCK EQUATION

It is interesting to understand in which way the probabilities for the wave functions develop on Hilbert space which then allow to classify the possible diffusions in more detail. For example we note that some diffusions have the same diffusive term in the Fokker Planck equation governing the probability distribution on Hilbert space: The Fokker-Planck equation for the probability density p with respect to the "Hilbert space volume element" $\mathcal{D}\psi_R\mathcal{D}\psi_I$ (R and I denoting real and imaginary part) reads

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial p_t(\psi)}{\partial t} = &- \sum_{m\in\{R,I\}}\int\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi(x)_m}\left(A(\psi)_m p(\psi)\right)\right](x)\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{l,m\in\{R,I\}}\int\int\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\psi(x)_l\partial\psi(y)_m}\left(D(\psi)p(\psi)\right)\right](x,y)_{l,m}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y\ ,\end{aligned}$$

if the diffusion matrix D is defined via its real entries

$$[D(\psi)](x,y)_{l,m} = \sum_{k=1}^{n}[B_k(\psi)](x)_l[B_k(\psi)](y)_m\,.$$

More precisely, choosing an orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space and introducing the corresponding complex coordinates $x_1 = (x_{1,R}, x_{1,I}), x_2, \ldots$, one can write

$$\frac{\partial p_t(x)}{\partial t} = -\sum_{\substack{k=1,2,\ldots\\ m\in\{R,I\}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k,m}}\left([A(x)]_{k,m}p(x)\right) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{i,j=1,2,\ldots\\ m,n\in\{R,I\}}}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{i,m}\partial x_{j,n}}\left([D(x)]^{i,m}_{j,n}p(x)\right)$$

where the diffusion matrix D has entries

$$[D(x)]^{i,m}_{j,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} [B_k(x)]_{i,m} [B_k(x)]_{j,n} \, .$$

Thus, within this calculus, one has to consider the Hilbert space as a real one with double dimension. In particular, the complex matrix $\sum_k |B_k\rangle\langle B_k|$ can be computed from D, but not vice versa - the distribution of ψ_t is not fixed by $\sum_k |B_k\rangle\langle B_k|$.

Replacing the matrix u by ou, where o is real orthogonal, leaves not only $\sum_k |B_k\rangle\langle B_k|$, but also D invariant; in particular, for any real orthogonal u, the diffusion matrix is the same as for $u_{i,j} = \delta_{ij}$ (the standard collapse equation). With complex entries, this need not be the case. The simplest example is the choice $u_{ij} = i\delta_{ij}$ which, assuming that the L_k are self-adjoint, gives $B_k(\psi) = iL_k\psi$ and $A(\psi) = -iH\psi \frac{1}{2}\sum_k L_k^2\psi$, i.e. a linear equation reproducing Eq. (4) and generalizing (22).

We remark that having introduced the probability distribution p allows us to write the density matrix more explicitly as the second moment of the probability distribution on the Hilbert space, namely

$$\rho_t(x, y) = \int \psi(x)\overline{\psi(y)}\mathcal{D}[\psi] \, .$$

IV. BORN'S STATISTICAL LAW

In the previous discussion, we never required that the collapse of the wave function should occur according to Born's statistical law, which is the standard rule of quantum mechanics. But indeed one can prove that, in measurement situations, collapse model predict that outcomes are distributed according to the Born rule [24, 34]. Accordingly, as first noted in [23, 24], this rule is the only probability rule which is compatible with the requirements of no-faster-than-light signalling and norm preservation.

Here we wish to comment on the reason why this is indeed the case. This can be understood by considering the following situation. Assume that a state vector ψ suddenly collapses—because of a not otherwise specified collapse dynamics—to one of the eigenstates $|n\rangle$ of a (self-adjoint) operator L, with a probability distribution p_n. The operator describing the collapse effect is:

$$T[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|] \; = \; \sum_n p_n \frac{P_n|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|P_n}{||P_n|\psi\rangle||^2}, \tag{24}$$

with $P_n = |o_n\rangle\langle o_n|$. Such an operator is trace preserving (the analog of norm conservation). If we also require T to be a linear operator (as required by the no faster-than-light signalling condition), than the only possible choice is to take $p_n = ||P_n|\psi\rangle||^2$, which is the Born's statistical law.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A.B. acknowledges partial financial support from INFN and COST (MP1006). He wishes to thank S.L. Adler and S. Weinberg for stimulating discussions. D.D. and G.H. acknowledge helpful discussions with M. Kolb.

---

[1] J.S. Bell, *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press (1988).

[2] G.C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini and T. Weber, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 470 (1986).

[3] G.C. Ghirardi, P. Pearle and A. Rimini, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 78 (1990).

[4] L. Diosi, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 1165 (1989).

[5] A. Bassi and G.C. Ghirardi, Phys. Rept. **379**, 257 (2003).

[6] S.L. Adler and A. Bassi, Science **325**, 275 (2009).

[7] A. Bassi, K. Lochan, S. Satin, T.P. Singh and H. Ulbricht, *Models of Wave-function Collapse, Underlying Theories, and Experimental Tests*, arXiv:1204.4325 (2012).

[8] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 062116 (2012). arXiv:1109.6462v3 (2011).

[9] S. Weinberg, Ann. Phys. **194**, 336 (1989). Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 485 (1989).

[10] L. Diosi, Phys. Lett. A **105**, 199 (1984).

[11] R. Penrose, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. **356**, 1927 (1998).

[12] D. Giulini and A. Grossardt, Class. Quant. Grav. **28**, 195026 (2011).

[13] M. Arndt *et al.*, Nature **401**, 680 (1999).

[14] S. Gerlich *et al.*, Nature Physics **3**, 711 (2007).

[15] S. Gerlich *et al.*, Nature Comm. **2**, 263 (2011).

[16] S. Dimopoulos *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **678**, 37 (2009).

[17] W. Marshall *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 130401 (2003).

[18] O. Romero-Isart *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 013803 (2011).

[19] S.L. Adler, Journ. Phys. A **40**, 2935 (2007).

[20] N. Gisin, Hel. Phys. Acta **62**, 363 (1989). Phys. Lett. A **143**, 1 (1990).

[21] N. Gisin and M. Rigo, Journ. Phys. A **28**, 7375 (1995).

[22] J. Polcinski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 397 (1991).

[23] S.L. Adler and T.A. Brun, Journ. Phys. A **34**, 1 (2001).

[24] S.L. Adler, *Quantum Theory as an Emergent Phenomenon*, Cambridge University Press (2004).

[25] Two ensembles are said to be *equivalent* if they generate the same density matrix: $\sum_k p_k|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k| = \sum_k q_k|\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|$, where $\{\psi_k\}, \{\phi_k\}$ are the vectors belonging to the two ensembles and p_k, q_k the associated probabilities, respectively.

[26] G. Lindblad, *Commun. Path. Phys.* **48**, 119 (1976).

[27] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski and E.C.G. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* **17**, 821 (1976).

[28] More precisely, and with reference to the calculations in [24], linearity of the operators is not used up to Eq. (6.13a)—just standard Itô calculus is used. However, in going from (6.13a) to (6.13c) linearity is used in pulling the stochastic expectation onto $\hat{\rho}$. Moreover, H_{eff}, M^R and M^I are assumed to be self-adjoint, in calculating the time derivatives of the norm and density matrix.

[29] L. Arnold, *Stochastic Differential Equations: Theory and Applications*, Dover Publications (2013).

[30] M. A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* , Cambridge University Press (2000).

[31] G.C. Ghirardi, R. Grassi and P. Pearle, Found. Phys. **20**, 1271 (1990).

[32] S.L. Adler and A. Bassi, Journ. Phys. A **40**, 15083 (2007).

[33] S.L. Adler, D.C. Brody, T.A. Brun and L.P. Hughston, Jour. Phys. A **34**, 8795 (2001).

[34] A. Bassi and D.G.M. Salvetti, Journ. Phys. A **40**, 9859 (2007).